

## CLAYTON PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION MEETING

Monday, June 7, 2010

The Center of Clayton - Multipurpose Rooms B & C

### The following members were present:

Alex Berger	Judy Goodman
Brad Bernstein	Rosemary Hardy
Dick Hyde	Eric Schneider
Mimi Deem	Mark Winings

### Excused/Absent

Ira Berkowitz  
Jessie Hoagland  
Omri Praiss

### *Also present:*

Patty DeForrest  
Eric Gruenenfelder  
Susan Renard  
Toni Siering

**Approval of Minutes:** The Commission members did not approve the meeting minutes due to the format of the meeting. They will be on the agenda at the July meeting.

**Presentation – Shaw Park:** SWT conducted a discussion session that included a PowerPoint presentation at the meeting. (Please see the attached meeting minutes taken by SWT.) The SWT Consultants encouraged informal discussion throughout their presentation. It is important to note that this presentation took place prior to Shaw Park Stakeholder meetings.

Mr. Berger stated that the CBD plan is not finalized; therefore we do not know what the CBD Master Plan will look like in 90-120 days. The presentation slide referencing the CBD Master Plan needs to be separated in some way so it does not appear as if it is finished. At this time, no one is really ready to address what is going on with the CBD plan. Alex stated that there is no comparison between the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and the CBD Master Plan. It does not seem necessary to include it in the presentation. It will take away from what the goal of these meetings. Ms. DeForrest stated that we should not ignore it though, because it is worth mentioning. Many people in the community attended the public forums about the CBD Master Plan. The CBD Master Plan does discuss Shaw Park. At the conclusion of this discussion, the consensus was to not bring it up as a discussion point and to make sure the mentioning of the CDB plan does not take away from the importance of the other projects.

Ms. DeForrest noted that the BOA accepts our Master Plans rather than approving the plan. The BOA approves or disapproves our budgetary needs for Master Plan projects. The Parks and Recreation Commission will review the final plans after all public meetings take place.

The consultants hope to get some additional feedback on walking trails from the public. The community has wanted walking trails for a long time. The biggest Parks and Recreation issue is the lack of walking and biking trails throughout the City of Clayton.

The amphitheater has been proposed multiple times. Ms. Judy Goodman asked if the lay of the land allows for open air seating areas. The answer is yes, the land allows a very natural open air seating area. It would not have to be a formal amphitheater. It could be very casual. There would be enough seating for 200-300 people if placed in the location called for in the 2007 plan. The proposed plan would not require the mulch pile to be moved.

Mr. Berger stated that individuals who attend the public forums and stakeholder meetings will not know about the current usage of our green space. Therefore, it would be helpful to present some statistics around metrics per square footage. Some places in Shaw Park may be overused and some may be underutilized. The consultants said there are standards based on square footage and they can add these types of details to their presentation. Further, the Commission members would like to see a diagram that shows green space between sites, and determines active versus passive space. It was pointed out that the passive part takes place all day in the park.

The ice rink project ideas that were proposed by the Ice Rink Task force were discussed. All three renderings propose some type of covering over the rink. There are many limiting factors as the ice rink exists. The ice rink building is not air conditioned and therefore has limited use in the summer. Other factors that were discussed include: the effect the buildings around the ice rink have on the rink and the loss of time at the rink due to rain and the sun. Presenting data about usage at the rink is vital.

**Presentation – Hanley Park:** Planning and Design Studio conducted a discussion session that included a PowerPoint presentation on Hanley Park. This consultants' presentation did include meeting notes from the Stakeholders meetings. The meetings took place before the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting. (Please see the attached meeting minutes from the Planning and Design Studio consultants.)

The focus of the presentation was based on determining and exploring what type of ancillary building should be located at Hanley Park to enhance the site. The top priorities for improving Hanley Park were also a priority at the meetings.

Some of the input from the stakeholders included: acquiring more land, having additional parking, adding restrooms, the concern of larger functions related to parking, the lack of a formal gathering space and the lack of staff office space. The stakeholders were asked what events they had attended or what they would like to see take place. Some of the input included: seeing it used as a tool for history, more educational group opportunities should be explored, activity focused space for the neighborhood, used as an alternative site for the Farmer's Market and have more virtual learning. The big picture focused on obtaining some land at Maryland School and the development of a below or above grade learning / interpretative center. Miscellaneous comments consisted of: conversations about the fact that Wilson school has a good underground site. At Hanley House, visiting groups do not stay long because there is no where for them to sit or hang out after their tour or event. Mr. Berger stated that the Hanley Park neighbors were more conservative than he expected them to be based on their comments. The neighbors expressed the fact that they are uncertain about the idea of doing more at the Hanley House and bathrooms are a must.

The Century Foundation members think an underground building is great; however residents in the area feel differently. What needs to be explored are: what possibilities are doable to make the Hanley House and Hanley Park more viable. Hanley Park needs to become a better asset for the community. The neighbors believe the site cannot support another building. They love the green space and want to keep it that way.

The consultants discussed the possibility of having a two-fold plan for the park: a long term strategy for the park and a plan focused on what can be done for Hanley Park right now. The Commission members are in favor of this plan.

The consensus among Commission members is that the Hanley House is more of a historical type of space. It is very apparent it cannot tolerate hundreds of people. The site is limited because it is in a residential area. One idea is that maximizing it by foot traffic is not necessary, it can be done virtually. Virtual learning has already taken place and it has been successful. Also, many Clayton schools have brought groups of twenty to the Hanley House, which has been a great educational experience for students, as well as a very practical amount of students for this venue.

The Planning and Design Studio consultants told the Commission that the Hanley Park site is being surveyed. After the survey is complete some of the drawings shown in their presentation will be modified. Sketch-up drawings were designed to give visual ideas of where things could or would be placed on the site. An above grade, 725 square foot site with two restrooms was shown on the maps in two possible locations. A below grade rendering was also shown during the meeting. It was designed as a 3,500 square foot building. There was some discussion about whether or not to include the option of an underground building at the public forums. It was determined to keep it in as a conceptual design and as a topic for discussion. The drawings also showed the possibilities of how to make the site ADA accessible. There are a couple of reasonable options. When asking for federal assistance the site must be ADA accessible.

**Old Business / New Business:** There is no old or new business to report.

Respectfully Submitted By:

Denise Ucinski